

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/825,832 04/15/2004		Charles Wu	MS1-347USC1	9462		
22801	7590	12/08/2005		EXAMINER		
	YES PLLC		PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B			
	WA 99201	NUE SUITE 500	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
•				2154		
				DATE MAILED: 12/08/2009	DATE MAILED: 12/08/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			10/825,832	WU, CHARLES	WU, CHARLES				
			Examiner	Art Unit					
			Ashok B. Patel	2154					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communi or Reply	ication app	ears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence a	ddress				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M. In the provisions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months are departed term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DA of 37 CFR 1.13 nunication. nututory period w will, by statute.	TE OF THIS COMMUN 6(a). In no event, however, may ill apply and will expire SIX (6) Mo cause the application to become	NICATION.  a reply be timely filed  ONTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on 23 Se	entember 2005						
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 September 2005</u> .  This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.								
		•		atters, prosecution as to the	e merits is				
-,									
Dispositi	on of Claims		.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,					
<b>4</b> )⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
·	Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
′									
	on Papers		o.oo.oo.oo.oo.oo	·					
_	·								
·	The specification is objected to by the								
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.									
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
	_	by the Exa	aminer. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form P	10-152.				
Priority t	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:									
	<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> </ol>								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
	application from the Internation								
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action	n for a list o	of the certified copies no	ot received.					
Attachment	:(s)		•						
1) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P1		Paper No	o(s)/Mail Date	0.450)				
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F · No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/23/2005</u> .	PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of 6) Other: _	Informal Patent Application (PTC	J-102)				

Art Unit: 2154

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-5 are subject to examination.

### Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 09/23/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

## Applicant's argument:

## Claims 1 and 2,

"Chase does not show or disclose using only one list of corresponding objects that can perform preservation of objects during synchronization even if the list only exists on one of the devices being synchronized.

## **Examiner's response:**

Claim 1 recites "if an object is on the list, then instructing the second computing device to refrain from updating the object when the first computing device cannot access the corresponding object."

Chase teaches in col. 13, line 30-49, "On the desktop C, the tags 216 are implemented as a data structure as part of the data synchronization software that runs on the desktop computer C. These tags 216 point to one of the field mapping table entries 250-252 which contain information about the handheld computer H data as well as the desktop C data for the purpose of creating a mapping between data records. In addition, the desktop tags 216 would need to point to the signature table entries 240-243 containing a signature for each desktop data element to be used during synchronization to determine if the associated data has been modified since the last

Art Unit: 2154

synchronization session. This signature structure is used because there is no direct method that informs the desktop tag when data has been changed. Likewise, field-to-field mappings would also need to be constructed since desktop PIMs are likely to support more fields than handheld PIMs. By definition, these mappings also provide a mechanism for filtering out fields allowing more control over what data to share and what data to keep exclusive." Thus Chase teaches "if an object is on the list, then instructing the second computing device to refrain from updating the object when the first computing device cannot access the corresponding object."

### Applicant's argument:

#### Claim 3,

"The Chase reference does not show or disclose listing pairs of corresponding objects and protecting an object and the data items in contains from deletion during synchronization if a corresponding object in a listed pair is unavailable."

#### **Examiner's response:**

Claim 3 recites "synchronizing each available pair of objects with new data items from either object in the pair; protecting an object and the data items it contains from deletion during synchronization if a corresponding object in a listed pair is unavailable.

As stated above, Chase teaches in col. 13, line 30-49, "By definition, these mappings also provide a mechanism for filtering out fields allowing more control over what data to share and what data to keep exclusive." Thus Chase teaches synchronizing each available pair of objects with new data items from either object in

Art Unit: 2154

the pair; protecting an object and the data items it contains from deletion during synchronization if a corresponding object in a listed pair is unavailable.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4 and 5 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### **Double Patenting**

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to

Application/Control Number: 10/825,832

Art Unit: 2154

be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 5 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 12, 18, of U.S. Patent No. 6, 862, 617. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following limitations shown below.

#### US Patent 6, 862, 617

## **Instant Application**

## Claim 1, A method comprising:

without input from a user, automatically identifying storage volumes currently accessible to a first device, wherein the storage volumes store objects;

based on the identification of storage volumes currently accessible to the first device, automatically identifying objects subject to deletion from a second device during a synchronization process to occur between the first device and the second device;

without input from a user, <u>automatically</u> <u>preventing deletion of the objects subject to deletion during the synchronization process</u>; and

automatically synchronizing only objects contained in the storage volumes currently accessible to the first device.

Claim 1, A method of synchronizing objects between two devices when some of the objects are intermittently unavailable on one of the devices, wherein the method prevents the devices from deleting an object when its corresponding object on the other device is unavailable, comprising:

creating a list of the objects to update on a first computing device and a second computing device, wherein the objects on the second computing device are updated using corresponding objects on the first computing device; and if an object is on the list, then instructing the second computing device to refrain from updating the object when the first computing device cannot access the corresponding object.

The obvious limitations are identified as underlined. Please note that Claim 1of the instant application preamble insists on "the method prevents the devices from deleting an object when its corresponding object on the other device is unavailable" identifying the specific feature of the method of synchronization, thus "Updating" is including "deleting".

Application/Control Number: 10/825,832

Art Unit: 2154

Claim 12, A method of synchronizing objects between a portable computer and a base computer, wherein the base computer attempts to delete objects during synchronization if corresponding objects are not accessible to the portable computer, the method comprising:

storing an object on a removable storage device, wherein the removable storage device is configured to be inserted into and removed from the portable computer;

automatically creating an association between the object and a corresponding object on the base computer; and

without user intervention, synchronizing the object stored on the removable storage device with the corresponding object on the base computer if the removable storage device is inserted into the portable computer; and

without user intervention, <u>automatically</u> <u>preventing the corresponding object on the base computer from being deleted if the removable storage device is not inserted into the portable computer.</u>

Claim method of maintaining 3, а contemporaneous within data items corresponding objects when one of the corresponding objects has new data items wherein the method prevents devices from deleting an object during synchronization when its corresponding object is unavailable, (abstract), comprising:

listing pairs of corresponding objects, wherein a first member of each pair resides on a first computing device and a second member of each pair resides on a second computing device; synchronizing each available pair of objects with new data items from either object in the pair; and protecting an object and the data items that it contains from deletion during synchronization if a corresponding object in a listed pair is unavailable.

The obvious limitations are identified as underlined. Please note that Claim 1 of the instant application preamble insists on "wherein the method prevents devices from deleting an object during synchronization when its corresponding object is unavailable" identifying the specific feature of the method of synchronization, thus "maintaining contemporaneous data items" is including "deletion" during synchronization.

Please also refer to the above for claims 4

and 5.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

**6.** The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/825,832 Page 7

Art Unit: 2154

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application

designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated Chase, jr.

(US 5, 974. 238).

Referring to claim 1,

Chase teaches a method of synchronizing objects between two devices when some of

the objects are intermittently unavailable on one of the devices, wherein the method

prevents the devices from deleting an object when its corresponding object on the other

device is unavailable,, comprising:

creating a list of the objects to update on a first computing device and a second

computing device, wherein the objects on the second computing device are updated

using corresponding objects on the first computing device (Abstract); and

if an object is on the list, then instructing the second computing device to refrain

from updating the object when the first computing device cannot access the

corresponding object. (col. 13, line 30-49, Fig. 5)

Referring to claim 2,

Chase teaches the method as recited in claim 2, further comprising removing the object

from the list when the corresponding object is permanently removed from the first

device. (Fig. 5, element "delete")

Referring to claim 3,

Application/Control Number: 10/825,832 Page 8

Art Unit: 2154

Chase teaches a method of maintaining contemporaneous data items within corresponding objects when one of the corresponding objects has new data items wherein the method prevents devices from deleting an object during synchronization when its corresponding object is unavailable, (abstract), comprising: listing pairs of corresponding objects, wherein a first member of each pair resides on a first computing device and a second member of each pair resides on a second computing device; synchronizing each available pair of objects with new data items from either object in the pair; and protecting an object and the data items that it contains from deletion during synchronization if a corresponding object in a listed pair is unavailable. (col. 13, line 30-49, Fig. 5)

### Referring to claim 4,

Chase teaches a method of maintaining a contemporaneous corresponding objects on a first and a second device throughout synchronization, wherein the method prevents the devices from deleting an object when its corresponding object is unavailable (Abstract) comprising:

Creating a list of corresponding objects prior to the synchronization (Fig. 5);

During synchronization, determining if an object on the list exists in the first device; if the object does not exist in the first device then determining if the object exists in the second device; and if the object exists in the second device then protecting the object from deletion and allowing the first device to access the object or providing the object to the first device. (col. 13, line 30-49, Fig. 5)

#### Referring to claim 5,

Chase teaches a synchronization method for computing devices, wherein the method prevents devices from deleting an object when its corresponding object is unavailable, comprising: creating a list of corresponding objects stored on two computing devices (Fig.5); communicatively coupling the two computing devices for synchronization (Fig. 1F); preventing deletion of the object during synchronization when the corresponding object is unavailable and the object is on the list. ((col. 13, line 30-49)

#### Conclusion

**Examiner's note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Application/Control Number: 10/825,832 Page 10

Art Unit: 2154

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abp

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100